

**MADISON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
AUGUST 28, 2006**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lane Adamson, Pat Bradley, Dorothy Davis, John Lounsbury, Dave Maddison, Bill Olson, Ed Ruppel, and Laurie Schmidt.

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** Eileen Pearce and Ann Schwend.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Marilyn Ross, Debra Doerflinger, County Commissioner Ted Coffman, Justin Houser, Chris Murphy, Dawn Myrvik, Beau Blixseth, Mike Ducennois, Bob Sumpter, Larry Pine, Tom Henesh, Kevin Germain, Jessi Fanelli, Barry Rice, Diane Rice, Dick Dolan, Bob Bayley, Ed Carracciolo, Melinda Merrill, Kay Willett, Toni Bowen, Chris Lowe, Wayne Lower, Scott Payne, Clay Landry, Jamie Landry, Dave Bricker, Phyllis Bowles, Greg Rice, Karen Rice, Cindy Owings, Jayre Leech, Jerry Wing, Dave Wing, Jan Murphy, Marina Smith, Elissa Mitchell, Don Bowen, Jennifer Boyer, Julie Dewey, Mary Ellen Wolfe, David Schwalbe, Stephanie Becker, Lynn Owens, Devonna Owens, Caren Roberty, Tracy Menuez, County Planner Doris Fischer, and Planner I Staci Beecher.

**President Bill Olson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.**

**MOTION:** To approve the minutes of the July 31, 2006 meeting with revisions.  
**Moved by:** Ed Ruppel. **Seconded by:** John Lounsbury. **All voted aye.**

**President's Comments:** President Olson commented on the full agenda and the significant amount of activity going on.

**Public Comment:** None

**Review of Preliminary Plat, Greenhouse Commercial Park, Ennis (Madison Development, Inc., landowner)**

Staci Beecher presented some highlights of this proposed project located approximately 1.5 miles north of Ennis along US Hwy. 287 North. Landowner Chris Murphy originally submitted the subdivision application under the name Murphy Minor Subdivision, but since has indicated that he would like to change the name to Greenhouse Commercial Park. This name change can occur at the time of final plat.

The land is comprised of 7.9 acres and would create five commercial/industrial lots ranging in size of 1.2 to 1.9 acres. The property historically contained a greenhouse and aviation business. Staci stated that there is currently a sizeable building on the property. There is currently one approach permit that has been issued by the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT). There will be no additional permits issued due to the controlled access corridor this property lies in. There are already commercial businesses located in this area north of Ennis.

Recent agency comments included a letter from Madison County Director of Emergency Management Frank Ford recommending sprinkler systems for commercial buildings. Also, a telephone conversation on August 28, 2006 with Madison Valley Rural Fire Chief Shawn Christensen brought about another recommendation for pressurized sprinkler systems for all new commercial construction. The Planning Staff recommendation was to approve the project with conditions.

Landowner Chris Murphy, stated that he was inclined to add a recommendation for indoor sprinkler systems in the covenants. It is difficult to determine what type of fire protection is feasible for these lots, as the types of businesses are undetermined at this time.

#### **Comments/Questions from the Planning Board and Others For Chris Murphy:**

- If the cul-de-sac has a 110 ft. diameter there will only be a 5 ft. right-of-way. This seems like it is tight and the right-of-way should be clarified.  
The surveyor made a mistake and the cul-de-sac should show a 100 ft. instead of a 110 ft. cul-de-sac diameter. There will be 100 ft. of drivable surface.
- Would you consider putting downward lighting provisions in the covenants?  
Yes.
- Do you currently have any plans for the property?  
Currently, the site and existing building are being evaluated for potential uses.
- Do we need to add a fire condition for sprinkler systems as mentioned by Frank Ford and Shawn Christensen?  
Doris stated that currently we have no enforcement mechanism for requiring this.
- The need for sprinkler systems depends on the nature of the business. If it is appropriate, sprinkler systems would be a good idea.  
Sprinkler systems will be encouraged where they are appropriate. This should be favorable for insurance coverage as well.

**MOTION: To recommend approval of the Murphy Minor Subdivision as per the conditions outlined in the staff report. Moved by: Laurie Schmidt. Seconded by: John Lounsbury. All voted aye.**

#### **PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the subdivision, staff report with Proposed Findings of Fact, August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2006 public meeting, subsequent review and discussion, the Planning Board recommends Preliminary Plat Approval be granted to the Murphy Minor Subdivision, subject to the conditions listed below:

#### ***[Standard conditions]***

1. Any and all adopted State and County requirements and standards which apply to this proposed subdivision must be met unless otherwise waived for cause by the governing body.

2. A notarized declaration of “Right to Farm” and “Emergency Services Information” (Appendix T. of November 2000 Madison County Subdivision Regulations) must be filed with the final plat.
3. The final plat must be accompanied by a certification by a licensed title abstractor showing the owners of record, the names of any lienholders or claimants of record against the land, and the written consent to the subdivision from any lienholders or claimants of record against the land.
4. Road and utility easements shall be clearly shown and labeled on the final plat.
5. Future modification of any elements shown on the plat may not be made without County review and approval.

**[Additional site-specific conditions]**

6. Prior to final plat approval, DEQ must approve all lots for water, sewer, solid waste, and storm drainage.
7. Prior to any construction requiring sanitation, a Madison County septic permit must be obtained for the lot being built on.
8. Prior to final plat approval, business addresses shall be assigned in accordance with Madison County’s rural addressing and Emergency 911 system.
9. Prior to final plat approval, a copy of the previously obtained MDT Approach Permit shall be submitted to the Madison County Planning Office.
10. Prior to final plat approval, the public access subdivision roads shall be constructed by the developer in compliance with the design standards outlined in the November 2000 Madison County Subdivision Regulations, as amended. The subdivision roads shall be classified as a “level road” with “high density” due to the commercial nature of the project. (See page 47 of the regulations). Road signs must be installed, and reseeded of the disturbed areas must occur. All road maintenance, including but not limited to grading and snowplowing and removal, shall be the responsibility of the landowners, not Madison County. In the event that the roads and other such required improvements are not completed prior to the final plat submission, an Improvements Agreement and irrevocable Letter of Credit or equivalent guarantee (see Subdivision Regulations, Appendix M.) shall be filed with the Board of County Commissioners prior to final plat approval. The amount of the Letter of Credit shall be 125% of the engineer’s estimated cost for the

improvements. Any letter of credit must cover the time period needed to complete project improvements.

11. A road maintenance agreement for Fischers Way with the adjacent landowner to the North shall be recorded with final plat.

### **Public Hearing and Review of Preliminary Plat, The Overlook Subdivision at the Yellowstone Club, Big Sky (Yellowstone Mountain Club LLC and Yellowstone Development, LLC; landowners)**

Doris Fischer provided an overview of this project located within the Yellowstone Club Phases 1 and 2 in Big Sky. This is a 24 acre site that fronts onto Andesite Ridge Road and would create five single family lots ranging in size from three to five acres. The site historically obtained preliminary plat approval for five single-family residential lots back in 1999. However, subsequent actions led to the aggregation of lots into one parcel with an open space tract. This land already has DEQ approval for five structures.

There is one site specific concern about Lot 201 and one of the alternative building envelopes. Doris mentioned that this area was on a steep slope and access may be difficult. Adjacent Lot 92 owner also expressed concern about this building site location. Also, as development occurs there is an increasing demand placed on MT Hwy 64 and US Hwy 191. The Planning Staff recommendation was to approve the project with conditions.

Yellowstone Club Representative Bob Sumpter agreed that the access to the western building envelope on Lot 201 was difficult. However, he asked the Planning Board to consider allowing a ski cabin with a pathway and not a road. Also, there would be no bathroom facilities at the ski hut. He also stated that the Yellowstone Club has always participated in transportation and traffic studies and will do so in the future. He also expressed concern that development may potentially be delayed by the County due to the traffic issues. The Yellowstone Club has recently made a 33-passenger van available to employees traveling in from the Bozeman area. Also, there is a commitment to affordable housing and the building of a high school in Big Sky. Justin Houser, from Morrison and Maierle Engineering submitted a revised plat containing slight changes in the open space.

### **Comments/Questions from the Planning Board and Others For Bob Sumpter:**

- Have you spoken to the Big Sky Transportation District for a year-round bus system?  
No. Will stay in communication with them on this issue.
- Where are the wildlife reports?  
The monitoring is currently taking place and a copy will be submitted.
- Have there been any human and wildlife conflicts on the golf course?  
Very little. It seems to be working well.
- There was a cursory report by Robert Eng regarding wildlife in the application packet.

Will speak to Eng about this. It is the standard format used. For this small development the wildlife impacts will be less significant.

- The Master Plan required periodic wildlife reports.  
A wildlife report will be submitted.
- Is this property in the Gallatin Canyon Consolidated Rural Fire District (GCCRFD)?  
What about a mutual aid agreement?  
Yes, it has not been de-annexed. Property owners would need to be involved in a de-annexation. There has been effort to work with GCCRFD, but no success.
- County could help facilitate communication between the Yellowstone Club and the GCCRFD.
- Is there enforcement of good food storage practices by residents?  
Yes.

**Public Comment:** None.

**MOTION: To approve The Overlook Subdivision with a change in Condition #11 to allow a second structure but with no water/septic or road access.**

**Moved by:** Dave Maddison. **Seconded by:** John Lounsbury. **All voted aye.**

#### **PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the subdivision application, the August 21<sup>st</sup> staff report, the August 28<sup>th</sup> public hearing, further discussion, and proposed Findings of Fact, the Planning Board recommends preliminary plat approval be granted to The Overlook Subdivision in the Yellowstone Mountain Club, subject to the conditions listed below.

#### ***Standard conditions:***

1. Any and all adopted State and County requirements and standards which apply to this proposed subdivision must be met unless otherwise waived for cause by the governing body.
2. A notarized declaration of "Right to Farm" and "Emergency Services Information" must be filed with the final plat (See Appendix T, Madison County Subdivision Regulations).
3. The final plat must be accompanied by a certification by a licensed title abstractor showing the owners of record, the names of any lienholders or claimants of records against the land, and the written consent to the subdivision from any lienholders or claimants of record against the land.
4. All subdivision road, utility, and emergency access easements shall be shown or cited on the final plat.
5. Prior to final plat approval, written approval of a noxious weed management plan must be obtained from the Madison County Weed Board.
6. Future modification of any elements shown on the plat may not be made without County review and approval.

***Additional site-specific conditions:***

7. Prior to final plat approval, the Montana Department of Environmental Quality must approve the subdivision for water and sewer.

8. Prior to any construction requiring sanitation, a Madison County septic permit must be obtained for the lot being developed.

9. The face of the final plat shall include a statement regarding the availability of the geotechnical report, as well as a statement indicating that site-specific geotechnical investigations are required prior to actual construction.

10. In the event that sewer and water improvements are not completed prior to the final plat submission, an Improvements Agreement and irrevocable Letter of Credit or equivalent guarantee (see Subdivision Regulations, Appendix M) shall be filed with the Board of County Commissioners prior to final plat approval. The amount of the Letter of Credit shall be 125% of the engineer's (or contractor's) estimated cost for the improvements.

11. A building envelope plan shall accompany the final plat, or the final plat shall identify the building envelopes (subdivider's choice). If the subdivider chooses to submit a building envelope plan, the County Planning Office shall serve as a repository for the plan. Proposed building envelope changes shall require County review and approval. The face of the final plat shall reference the building envelope plan. The westernmost building envelope shown on Lot 201 on the preliminary plat is allowed (as a ski hut), if it has no access road or living facilities such as water/sewer.

12. Prior to final plat approval, lots must be assigned an address in accordance with the Madison County rural addressing and Emergency 911 system (Individual address signs may be installed as each building is developed).

13. Prior to final plat approval, the subdivider shall submit a copy of the 2004 and 2005 wildlife monitoring reports.

**Public Hearing and Review of Preliminary Plat, Cowboy Heaven Phase 4-A Planned Unit Development, Big Sky (Moonlight Basin Ranch, L.P. landowner)**

Doris summarized the staff report about this proposed project. This is the first subdivision application since the recent approval of the Overall Development Plan for Moonlight Basin Ranch. This project involves two sites, a 102 acre site and a 15 acre site. The larger parcel is proposed as an administrative tract along with four single-family residential lots. The administrative tract would contain a redesigned entryway, an administrative building, and some employee housing units. The smaller tract is located adjacent to current Ulrey's Lakes and Timber Ridge developments. The proposal is for four single-family residential lots that would range in size from 14 to 22 acres.

There was one concern expressed about the new entryway access road. Adjacent landowners Bill & Sandra Streets were concerned about visual, noise, and traffic impacts. Moonlight Basin Ranch has been working with the Streets' to design a lower roadway, and a stone wall with landscaping to help mitigate some impacts. Also, as more development occurs in Big Sky there is increased traffic on the roadways. The Planning Staff recommendation was to approve the subdivision with conditions.

Moonlight Basin Ranch Representative Kevin Germain added a few comments and gave an update on progress of the Overall Development Plan (ODP) Conditions. The Streets' seemed satisfied with the information provided by Moonlight. Doris confirmed this, based on a recent telephone call from the Streets.

ODP progress is as follows:

- Joe King has been hired to prepare a fuels management plan.
- In the process of trying to annex into the GCCRFD and working with Frank Ford on feasibility study for emergency services.
- Completed site specific cultural resources inventory.
- Completed geotech and wetland delineations for 75% of area.
- Started on wildlife monitoring and working with FWP.
- Installed 10,000 gallon water supply tank and pump for firefighting during clubhouse construction efforts.
- Working on affordable housing options for employees and emergency services personnel.
- Committed to staying within the density cap of the ODP.
- Working on the trail systems, but still have a lot of work to do.

**Public Comment: None.**

**MOTION: To recommend approval of Cowboy Heaven Phase 4-A with conditions outlined in the staff report. Moved by: Dave Maddison. Seconded by: Ed Ruppel. All voted aye.**

#### **PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the subdivision application, August 21<sup>st</sup> staff report, August 28<sup>th</sup> public hearing, further discussion, and proposed Findings of Fact, the Planning Board recommends preliminary plat approval be granted to the Cowboy Heaven Phase 4-A Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.), subject to the conditions listed below.

#### ***Standard conditions:***

1. Any and all adopted State and County requirements and standards which apply to this proposed subdivision must be met unless otherwise waived for cause by the governing body.
2. A notarized declaration of "Right to Farm" and "Emergency Services Information" must be filed with the final plat (See Appendix T, Madison County Subdivision Regulations).

3. The final plat must be accompanied by a certification by a licensed title abstractor showing the owners of record, the names of any lienholders or claimants of records against the land, and the written consent to the subdivision from any lienholders or claimants of record against the land.

4. All subdivision road, utility, and emergency access easements shall be shown or cited on the final plat.

5. Future modification of any elements shown on the plat may not be made without County review and approval.

***Additional site-specific conditions:***

6. Prior to final plat approval, the Montana Department of Environmental Quality must approve Lots 1 and 2 for water and sewer. A water and sanitation exemption statement for the Administrative Tract shall be added to the final plat.

7. Prior to any construction requiring sanitation, a Madison County septic permit must be obtained for the lot being developed (This covers Lots 1-4).

8. Prior to final plat approval, the Planning Office shall receive confirmation from the subdivider's geotechnical engineer, that the macrostability analysis for the vicinity of the subdivision has been completed.

9. It is possible that the County Road Supervisor will determine that improvements to the existing Jack Creek Road or Ulery's Lakes Road are needed in order to meet the County subdivision road standards outlined in the November 2000 Madison County Subdivision Regulations, as amended (the roads would be classified as "mountainous roads, p. 47 of the regulations). In addition, road signs may need to be installed, and reseeding of disturbed areas would be required. All road maintenance, including but not limited to grading and snowplowing and removal, shall be the responsibility of the landowners, not Madison County. In the event that roads and other such required improvements are not completed prior to the final plat submission, an Improvements Agreement and irrevocable Letter of Credit or equivalent guarantee (see Subdivision Regulations, Appendix M.) shall be filed with the Board of County Commissioners prior to final plat approval. The amount of the Letter of Credit shall be 125% of the engineer's estimated cost for the improvements. Any letter of credit must cover the time period needed to complete project improvements.

10. The existing pond/dry hydrant along Jack Creek Road shall be upgraded in accordance with the standards of GCCRFD or an equivalent fire protection service provider. In the event this upgrade is not completed prior to final plat submission, this project shall be covered in the Improvements Agreement described above.

11. During the construction period, MBR shall ensure that an adequate water supply is available for firefighting. "Adequacy" shall be determined by the GCCRFD, or an equivalent fire protection service provider.



12. Prior to final plat approval, MBR must annex this property into the GCCRFD; or, MBR must provide an equivalent arrangement for structural fire protection and emergency medical service. The determination of equivalency (in this condition, and in Conditions #10 and #11 above) will be made by the Madison County Office of Emergency Management and Madison County Commissioners.

13. General Note GN2 on the final plat shall be revised to read, "All roads providing primary access to this subdivision are accessible to the public. However, the roads owned by Moonlight Basin Ranch, L.P. will be maintained by Moonlight. Madison County will not be required to improve or maintain any non-County road within or providing access to the subdivision."

14. Any wetlands disturbance shall be covered by the appropriate permits.

15. Ridgetop development is prohibited.

16. A building envelope plan shall accompany the final plat, or the final plat shall identify the building envelopes (subdivider's choice). If the subdivider chooses to submit a building envelope plan, the County Planning Office shall serve as a repository for the plan. Proposed building envelope changes shall require County review and approval. The face of the final plat shall reference the building envelope plan. The Lot 1 building envelope shall be shifted to the east, to avoid the delineated wetland.

17. Prior to final plat approval, lots must be assigned an address in accordance with the Madison County rural addressing and Emergency 911 system (Individual address signs may be installed as each building is developed).

18. Prior to final plat approval, the subdivider shall submit a written status report on the MBR wildlife enforcement and public outreach/education program.

19. Prior to final plat approval, the subdivider shall obtain County approval of any realignment of Lone Mountain Trail (Big Sky Spur Road). Road design and landscaping plans shall be provided, and they shall demonstrate substantial buffering of this roadway system from the adjoining residences.

### **Public Hearing and Review of Proposed Madison County Housing Needs Assessment and Five-Year Plan**

Staci provided a brief overview of the plan. The Madison County Comprehensive Plan, 1999 Update identified affordable housing as a priority for the county. Since then, affordable housing has consistently been a topic of discussion at public meetings around the county. About a year ago, the Madison County Planning Office and County Commission secured a Community Development Block Grant to assess current housing conditions and assemble a housing plan. The Bozeman-based Human Resources Development Council (HRDC) was contracted to develop a housing plan for the county. Also, a Madison County Housing Taskforce was appointed to help guide the process. The County Planning Office provided technical assistance and coordination for this effort. The

Planning Staff recommended approval of the plan, as an amendment to the Madison County Comprehensive Plan.

There have been recent letters received from James Taylor and Mitch Furr, with suggestions for the Housing Plan. Caren Roberty from HRDC mentioned that recent letters, tonight's public comments, and any future input could be attached as an appendix to the plan.

**Public Comment:**

- Scott Payne mentioned the Montana Home Program may be worth researching.
- Bob Sumpter pointed out that income statistics have changed significantly from the 2000 Census Data. The incomes have increased in recent years.
- Bill Olson suggested that more localized market studies may be needed.
- Ted Coffman stated that the census data is based on full-time residents and does not incorporate seasonal residents into statistics.
- Tracey Menezes of HRDC indicated that the U.S. Census Bureau statistics are generally used for grant applications.
- David Schwalbe stated that he is currently working on the affordable housing problems in Big Sky. The document is helpful. The high prices of land make it difficult without tax revenues to help. Need families to build a community.

**Board Discussion:**

Laurie Schmidt expressed her support for the plan and commented that it was well-done.

**MOTION: To approve the Madison County Housing Needs Assessment and Five-Year Plan with the suggestions of Caren Roberty to attach additional comments as an appendix to the plan.**

**Moved by:** Laurie Schmidt. **Seconded by:** Dorothy Davis. **All voted aye.**

**Public Hearing and Review of Proposed Madison Valley Growth Management Action Plan**

Doris provided a bit of background leading up to the recent effort in the Madison Valley to put together this plan. The Madison Valley has had a local land use plan since 1998. The purpose of this plan was to preserve agriculture, open space, natural resources, and encourage attractive development. This plan was updated in 1999 to reflect changes. About a year ago, citizens in the Madison Valley started a movement to discuss the future and put together an updated plan to be incorporated into the County Comprehensive Plan. There were many educational public forums to identify shared values in the area. The County Planning Office has provided technical assistance for this effort. The Planning Staff recommended adoption of the Madison Valley Growth Management Action Plan as an amendment to the Madison County Comprehensive Plan.

**Public Comment:**

- David Bricker, a Madison Valley resident, expressed his support for the plan seeing it as a way to manage growth. He summarized the process in which the plan was formulated and clarified the survey.

- Karen Rice, landowner from Ennis and Harrison, presented a letter signed by 21 other residents identifying concerns about the proposed plan. She stated that the survey was confusing and that there is not a consensus among the community. She is not opposed to the whole plan, just the zoning portion and is in favor of an Open Space Bond.
- Bob Bayley, Madison Valley resident, expressed his support for the plan and concluded that it would give a sense of development predictability. He maintained that it was positive plan and could be modified to address concerns about zoning.
- Melinda Merrill, Madison Valley resident, expressed concerns about the plan, the survey, and the lack of consensus for the plan. She suggested a new survey was needed.
- Chris Lowe, landowner from Ennis, stated that he has been involved in the process and holds a full-time job. He stated that it is a positive effort that would help protect shared values and plan for the future. Lowe stated that no zoning decisions would take place tonight.
- Stephanie Becker, Harrison area landowner, expressed her support for the plan because some tools are needed to help protect this area. She stated that zoning helps increase land use predictability.
- Bob Sumpter, Madison Valley landowner, mentioned that he felt the same as the other 21 residents that oppose the plan. He stated that zoning may not be necessary and the plan was presented prematurely without enough agreement.
- Don Bowen, Ennis realtor and resident, expressed his support for the plan and for looking toward the future. He stated that it would not be detrimental to business.
- Diane Rice, Montana Representative and Harrison resident, urged the Board to carefully consider the plan and look at potential unintended consequences that may result. She expressed concerns about the national economy and how the plan may affect the local economy.
- Jayre Leech, Cameron resident, identified communication problems between both supporters and opponents. She commented on the need to work together to find common ground.
- Cindy Owings, McAllister resident, thanked residents for showing up and trying to plan for the future. She stated that the Bozeman area has not tried this approach and there are many problems there now.
- Greg Rice, landowner from the Madison Valley, stated that he was a substantial taxpayer in the county and was against zoning.
- Wayne Lower, a landowner in the Madison Valley, stated that he did not receive a survey. He stated that there are already enough laws to manage growth and more are not needed.

#### **Board Discussion:**

- What will approval of this plan actually do?  
Doris stated that it shows a commitment by the County to pursue the recommended steps in the plan. The County Commission actually makes the decision on the plan.
- There is a misunderstanding about zoning. There is already zoning available under state law. There are also parameters for how zoning can be used. By postponing a recommendation we are not addressing the future.

- This is a good plan, but reference to County-initiated zoning should be taken out of it. We should not be able to put restrictions on our neighbors.
- The forums were well attended. We need to look to other high growth areas and try to stay ahead of the curve. We need to be able to guide growth so we can benefit from it. Development regulations can help protect property values. Let's move forward with the plan.
- This is a positive plan that is not restrictive.
- The recommendation for approval creates a forum for more discussion. There is nothing binding in this plan, rather it sets a direction. There were some very strong opinions expressed tonight and that is what democracy is all about.
- Need to consider what this will do to a rancher that is in an ag district. This might decrease his/her property values. Some people will be negatively impacted by zoning.
- Some people may be negatively impacted by the lack of regulations.
- About 40% of land in the Madison Valley is already under conservation easement.
- Conservation easements are effectively voluntary zoning because they limit development. We need more conversations about this so it is not feared. Some major developers want zoning because it increases predictability.
- Development regulations come in many forms. Covenants are a type of regulation. It is time we look at the growth in the Madison Valley.
- This plan will extend the discussion about how to manage growth.

**MOTION: To approve the Madison Valley Growth Management Action Plan.**

**Moved by:** Laurie Schmidt. **Seconded by:** Ed Ruppel. **6 vote aye, 1 vote nay.** (Dave Maddison)

**Public Hearing and Review of Proposed Madison County Growth Policy**

Doris provided an overview of the new county growth policy and pointed out changes from the 1999 County Comprehensive Plan. If the County wants to use its County Comprehensive plan as a guide in subdivision review or County-initiated zoning, a Growth Policy must be adopted by October 1, 2006. While much of the material in the 1999 County Comprehensive Plan is still relevant, it lacks a few items required by current state law. The planning office held a series of community meetings around the county gathering citizen input. The major additions to the current comprehensive plan include: a chapter on projected trends, a statement of cooperation with other jurisdictions, information on subdivision review criteria and subdivision public hearings, and additional recommended county actions. The Planning Staff recommended adoption of the Madison County Growth Policy.

**Public Comment:** None.

**Board Discussion:**

- Does the appendix in the back contain the public comments from all of the public meetings?  
Yes.

**MOTION: To approve the Madison County Growth Policy.**

**Moved by:** Pat Bradley. **Seconded by:** Dorothy Davis. **All voted aye.**

### **Subdivision Pre-Application Discussion of the Landry Minor Subdivision, Waterloo**

Doris briefly described the conceptual ideas of this pre-application. The subject parcel contains 177 acres and would be split into five lots ranging in size from approximately 27 acres to 70 acres. This land has access off of Bench Road, which is a county road. There is a proposed common or green area in the middle of the lots consisting of about 40 acres. There will be a shift in location of irrigated land; however, the acreage in production will stay constant.

#### **Board Comments, with questions fielded by Clay Landry and Scott Payne.**

- What is the approximate emergency response time to the site?  
About 15-20 minutes from either Twin Bridges or Whitehall.
- Would like a field trip to the area to evaluate alluvial fan risks.
- What is the equivalent of water shares to miner's inches?  
They are the same. 60 water shares equals 60 miner's inches.

#### **Old Business:**

There was discussion about a field trip to Big Sky to look at Lone Moose Meadows and the Mountain Club within Boyne. These site visits are tentatively scheduled for Friday, September 29<sup>th</sup>. The Upland Meadows project was also suggested for a site visit. Due to the short time frame on this project, there will not be a scheduled site visit. The Planning Office will send out a map to Planning Board members locating the site of Upland Meadows. Other possible site tours to consider are the Landry Subdivision site near Waterloo and the Bullis Ranch near Livingston. The Bullis Ranch is considered a model subdivision site that might be useful to see.

#### **New Business:**

In response to a question, Doris mentioned that the new E-911 system seems to be working fine. There will be some 'reverse E-911 training' that allows personnel to delineate an area and send notices out to that area in the event of an emergency. The Whitehall area that is served by Qwest Communications is not yet active.

The County is also in the initial phase of a feasibility study to look at providing dispatch and emergency services to the Big Sky area within Madison County. Doug Forsman has been contracted to perform the feasibility study. President Bill Olson asked the planning staff to provide some information on Initiative I-154 to the Planning Board.

**The meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Planning Board will be September 25, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.**

---

**William J. Olson, President**

---

**Staci Beecher, Planner I**